United Nations S/PV.6503

Security Council

Sixty-sixth year

Provisional

6503rd meeting

Wednesday, 23 March 2011, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Li Baodong	(China)
Members:	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Barbalić
	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	Colombia	Mr. Osorio
	France	Mr. Briens
	Gabon	Mr. Messone
	Germany	Mr. Wittig
	India	Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri
	Lebanon	Ms. Ziade
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Portugal	Mr. Moraes Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	South Africa	Mr. Mashabane
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Parham
	United States of America	Mr. Dunn

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fourth session (S/2011/41)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

11-27495 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fourth session (S/2011/41)

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now being its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/2011/41, containing the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fourth session.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Permanent Representative of Germany and former Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission.

I now give the floor to Mr Wittig.

Mr. Wittig (Germany): On behalf of the members of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), I am pleased to present the report of the Commission on its fourth session (S/2011/41).

Strengthening the peacebuilding agenda, enhancing its impact in the field and providing continued support to the peacebuilding efforts in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone were at the core of the Commission's work in 2010. In September 2010, the Commission made Liberia the fifth country on the agenda in response to a request from the Security Council on behalf of the Government of Liberia. Most recently, the Commission responded to a request for advice and accompaniment from the Republic of Guinea. This was the first time that such a request was directly submitted to the Commission.

In 2010, peacebuilding and the future role of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture were very prominently discussed within and outside the United Nations. The review, which was ably guided by the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa, offered an opportunity to appreciate the potentials of and the challenges facing the Commission. The momentum generated by the 2010 review must be maintained especially as the Commission further expands its agenda.

The report of the Peacebuilding Commission reflects a collective effort on the part of the members of its Organizational Committee. Progress has been made in addressing emerging recommendations from the 2010 review, in particular in connection with the creation of a new PBC country-specific configuration on Liberia. The report also reflects the Commission's plans to take forward the recommendations from the review in a way that would facilitate its annual reporting to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The Commission is proceeding in this direction on the basis of a road map of actions in 2011. It focuses on meeting practical objectives and making concrete progress in enhancing the Commission's impact on national capacity-development, resource mobilization and aligning key actors behind common peacebuilding objectives.

Allow me to highlight a few elements from the report. First, the report underscores the thematic focus of the Commission during its fourth session around the theme "Partnership for peacebuilding". In view of the complexity of peacebuilding challenges and the multiplicity of actors, the need for coherence and partnerships cannot be overemphasized. Building and strengthening partnerships has been identified as a key area of potential value added for the Commission. In this regard, the Organizational Committee devoted the majority of its efforts and time to engaging the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank, and regional organizations, especially the African Union. Generally, the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons focused on joining up with a range of potential partners from civil society and academia.

Secondly, the Commission has particularly prioritized the need to strengthen the interaction with the principal organs of the United Nations. It worked to generate interest in its work across the membership of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. During the reporting period, the Commission witnessed a growing openness and encouraging signs of interest on the part of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The important thematic debates convened by the Security Council between February 2010 and February 2011 offered recurring opportunities for the PBC, the United Nations membership and senior leadership to engage with the Council around critical peacebuilding-related policies. The participation of the World Bank in a number of these debates also confirmed the evolving partnership with the Bank at a time when it is further developing its approach to assisting countries emerging from conflict. Briefings by the Chairs of the country configurations contributed to the discussions of the Council at its periodic considerations of the situations and mandates involving the countries on the Commission's agenda.

Most recently, the Council has engaged the Chairs in informal dialogues on certain country situations. The outcome of the thematic debates and the deepening of the engagement of the Chairs of the PBC country configurations marked an important step towards more serious consideration by the Council of the Commission's advisory role. I would like to advocate for enhanced interaction between the Commission and the Council.

The 2010 review highlighted in particular the potential for developing a dynamic linkage between the Commission and the Council. Eleven of the 15 members of the Security Council are currently members of the PBC. That joint membership provides a natural interface that could facilitate the Council's drawing more actively and regularly on the Commission's advice.

The Commission could provide early peacebuilding perspectives in the design and review of, or transition from, peacekeeping mandates. It could identify and promote country-specific sustainability factors. It could catalyse early partnerships with the international financial institutions. And it could benchmark and monitor the progression from stabilization to transition and consolidation.

The reporting period also witnessed the continuing development of the Commission's relationship with the Economic and Social Council through the established briefing made by the PBC Chairperson to the 2010 substantive session. In addition, the Council and the PBC jointly organized a special event on the Millennium Development Goals in countries emerging from conflict. That event testified to the Commission's growing advocacy role for an integrated approach to peacebuilding, including through well-deserved focus on the socio-economic dimension of peacebuilding.

Going forward, the Commission looks forward to further deepening its linkages with the General Assembly. There is a clear need to bring to bear the Assembly's perspective on key thematic issues.

Thirdly, the Commission continues to receive direct and substantive support from the Peacebuilding Support Office. Notwithstanding its stretched capacity, the Office has also been an essential linkage between the Commission and the operational entities within and outside the United Nations system. The Office has also continued to provide regular briefings on the activities and operations of the Peacebuilding Fund. Those briefings have contributed to deepening the understanding of the synergy between the Commission and the Fund in the countries on the Commission's agenda. The recently introduced interaction with the Fund's Advisory Group has provided the Commission with an opportunity to address a number of broad policy issues for the Fund.

The Fund's resources, combined with the efforts of the Commission, helped to ensure that the countries on the Commission's agenda benefited from the sustained attention and support of the international community, with 64 per cent of the Fund's total contributions being allocated to those countries.

By linking up the Peacebuilding Commission's work to that of peacekeeping, development and political actors in the field, the Commission has added considerable value. The challenge facing the Commission in demonstrating its full potential, however, is to ensure that its work is backed by a higher level of political commitment from the Member States and the senior leadership of the United Nations. As noted by the co-facilitators of the 2010 review report, "the review should be a wake-up call to strengthen the collective resolve to deal with peacebuilding in a more comprehensive and determined way". (*S/2011/41, para. 107*)

I hope that today's debate, like the debate that the General Assembly convened earlier in the week, will take us a step further towards realizing the full potential of the Commission as an advisory body that is uniquely positioned to help the United Nations meet the challenges facing our collective capacity to deliver on the promises to respond to the needs of millions of people in countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank Ambassador Wittig for his statement.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda), Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission: Over the past year, the Security Council convened a number of thematic debates on post-conflict peacebuilding. The frequency of the meetings and the scope of the discussion testify to the growing sense of commitment by the Council to take into consideration the complex challenges facing countries emerging from conflict. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) could certainly help the Council to deepen that commitment by providing three main advisory functions.

The first is an early peacebuilding perspective, which could contribute to the Council's consideration of the scope of the roles of peacekeeping missions in, and contributions to, the broader peacebuilding efforts undertaken by other actors in the field.

The second is an inclusive and flexible platform to forge partnerships and engagement with those key actors, thereby ensuring broader buy-in to peacebuilding processes and facilitating informed drawdowns of peacekeeping missions.

The third is supporting the countries on its agenda and monitoring the progression from stabilization to consolidation of peace on the basis of country-specific analyses of risks and opportunities.

I welcome the initial steps taken by the Council thus far to engage the Chairs of country-specific configurations in more interactive and informal dialogues around peacebuilding opportunities and challenges in certain countries on the PBC's agenda.

(*spoke in French*)

In reviewing the peacebuilding architecture, the co-facilitators underscored the potential advantages of broader and more frequent interaction between the Security Council and the Commission. In that regard, the contributions of members of the PBC that are members of the Council are important to achieving that goal. As the new Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, I am prepared to work closely with those members of Council, as well as with all other members, in order to identify appropriate measures to inject new momentum into that interaction.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I thank Ambassador Gasana for his briefing.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Council.

Mr. Parham (United Kingdom): I would like to start by thanking Ambassador Wittig and Ambassador Gasana for their very helpful briefings this morning. We are very grateful to Ambassador Wittig for his dedicated work over the past year, as well for the work of the Permanent Representatives of Canada, Belgium, Brazil, Jordan, Nepal and Switzerland in their roles as Chairs.

The annual report (S/2011/41) and the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) provided useful opportunities to take stock of the PBC's work. They described many of the Commission's achievements, as well as the challenges that the PBC faces. In looking at the focus of the PBC over the coming months, we should, in our view, consider three particular objectives.

The first concerns results and the need for the PBC to demonstrate clearly its contribution to addressing critical peacebuilding bottlenecks for the countries on its agenda. For example, the PBC needs to focus on galvanizing all those who need to contribute to the establishment of regional justice hubs in Liberia. It needs to help galvanize action to support progress in the implementation of the Economic Community of West African States road map in Guinea-Bissau. And it needs to rapidly support the Guinean Government in taking forward security sector reform.

The second objective concerns advice. We want the Security Council to seek the advice of the PBC regularly and proactively. But for that to happen, the PBC, supported by the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), needs to generate high-quality analysis on a particular problem and advice on possible options to overcome it and on what role different actors might play.

The third focus concerns the capacity of the PBC itself and the need for countries to progress off its agenda. In the past six months, we have had the welcome addition of two countries onto the PBC's agenda, and there is a possibility that other high-profile countries may also seek referral. That will put an

additional burden on the PBSO and on Member States. We need to explore the steps for graduating a country off the PBC's agenda or shifting to some lighter form of engagement.

We also think that the PBC has an important role to play in championing the civilian capacity review. For example, the PBC could help to rally support internationally for specific recommendations in the review. We would also welcome the PBC's advice when we take this up in the Security Council later this year. We further think that the PBC would benefit from forging greater links with the new grouping of 17 fragile States, known as the g7+. That group provided useful insights under the Bosnian debate on institutional capacity-building. We should hear more from the group. The PBC could provide a platform for it here in New York.

In conclusion, when we meet to discuss the PBC's annual report this time next year, we should look to see whether these objectives — results, advice and managing the PBC's capacity to best effect — are being met. The United Kingdom reiterates its commitment to helping to support their delivery.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): I would like to start by thanking you, Mr. President, for convening this debate on the Peacebuilding Commission's (PBC) annual report (S/2011/41), which constitutes an opportunity for the Council to reflect on the important role that the Commission plays in the United Nations system. I also thank Ambassador Peter Wittig for his excellent leadership during his chairmanship of the PBC. My delegation pledges its full support to Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana and wishes him every success as the Commission's Chair for 2011.

The past year was marked by the five-year review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which offered an opportunity for the Council to consider ways to perfect its work. The Commission is a relatively new body in the United Nations system, and the review allowed Council members to reflect both on the progress achieved so far and the challenges ahead. We once again thank the facilitators for their work and for the useful recommendations they presented.

In our view, there are three areas where the Council must continue to strengthen its work, namely, the integrated and multidimensional nature of peacebuilding, national ownership and partnerships with other relevant actors. As Brazil has already underscored on different occasions, it is of the utmost importance that the PBC enhance its integrated approach. During the open debate held in February by the Brazilian presidency (see S/PV.6479), the Council emphasized that security and development were closely interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

In addition to pursuing security and stabilization tasks, we believe that it is essential that peacebuilding strategies also focus increasingly on economic and social policies aimed at improving the living standards of affected populations. Assisting national Governments to restore their capacity to fight poverty and strengthen institutions is another responsibility that the Council cannot avoid. To name but a few, greater attention must be given to the provision of basic services, such as health and education; youth employment, including through vocational training; economic revitalization; and the fight against poverty. It is also essential to strengthen the voice of women. As we know, women are key actors in the economy, especially in agriculture, and can play a leading role in the prevention of conflicts.

Those dimensions are clearly interrelated. Tangible progress in economic and social issues will have a positive impact on the security situation. In Guinea-Bissau, for example, the improved economic situation in the country and the debt relief provided under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative opened the way to mobilizing more resources for institution-building, social services and security sector reform.

As for national ownership, there is no doubt that the actions that we undertake must be steered by the interests and needs of the affected country. A fluid dialogue with national Governments and support for political processes that can help local actors to forge a vision of their priorities should therefore be guiding principles of our activities.

The assistance provided must be tailored to what national stakeholders consider as their fundamental interests, and should focus on the consolidation of national institutions. Institutions are indispensable to enhancing national ownership and allowing for stronger public administration. As Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste José Luís Guterres highlighted before the Council in January (see S/PV.6472), international partners must help to build national institutions by working within them, since "one cannot

build a nation upon the principles of another" (*S/PV.6472, p. 6*).

Partnerships with different actors — and this brings me to my third point — is also instrumental to the success of any peacebuilding initiative. Reaching out to the international financial institutions and to regional and subregional organizations, such as the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States, should be continuously pursued. One of the areas in which partnerships can produce tangible results is the deployment of civilian capacities. As the recent report of the Secretary-General on this issue underscores, it is essential to protect and nurture local capacities, including through flexible arrangements and South-South cooperation.

My delegation echoes the call by Ambassador Peter Wittig for enhanced interaction between the Commission and the Council. We believe that the Security Council should resort more often to the advice of the PBC when discussing the mandates of missions in countries on the Commission's agenda. In February, during the Brazilian presidency, an interactive dialogue on the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi was held, with the presence of the Chair of the country-specific configuration, Ambassador Paul Seger. We hope that such initiatives will continue.

As Chair of the Guinea-Bissau country-specific configuration, Brazil has endeavoured to help that country to reach long-lasting peace and development. The activities described in the annual report are just a snapshot of what the country-specific configuration has done in critical areas such as security sector reform, advocacy before international financial institutions, resource mobilization and economic revitalization.

We are committed to continue to work in all of those areas in order to make the PBC increasingly meaningful and effective on the ground.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): Peacebuilding and peacekeeping-peacebuilding are and will remain core activities of the Council in the immediate future. Let me therefore begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for organizing this meeting today on post-conflict peacebuilding. The results of such initiatives will play a key role in determining the relevance and effectiveness of the Council and of the larger United Nations system in the decades to come.

Let me also thank the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for its detailed and insightful report (S/2011/41), as well as Ambassador Peter Witting, under whose able stewardship the report was prepared and who has presented it to us today. I also thank Ambassador Gasana for his statement.

The Peacebuilding Commission, through its Organizational Committee and country-specific configurations, has a central position in the global peacebuilding architecture. The working relationship of the Commission, the newest organ of the United Nations, with the Security Council and the General Assembly is thus of critical importance.

My delegation has been a member of the Commission since its inception. We favour close, regular and substantive interaction among the Commission, the Council and the Assembly so that the United Nations can deliver as one when it comes to setting the peacebuilding agenda.

Peacebuilding is a cooperative effort. The United Nations requires working with other peacebuilding actors, including international financial institutions. My delegation has noted the growing focus on the special characteristics of post-conflict situations involving an increasing number of development and economic actors. That, we expect, will have a positive impact on peacebuilding and on the growing need for resources for peacebuilding initiatives.

In an arena with many players, however, the United Nations must be conscious of the need to maintain the high ground in developing the normative basis for peacebuilding. An international effort is under way to understand the linkages between development, peace and security and to suggest solutions. The Council itself debated this issue six weeks ago under the Brazilian presidency. We must ensure that this effort is able to resist the temptation to create a new peacebuilding orthodoxy. Many of these efforts end up talking down rather than listening. That must be avoided at all costs.

My delegation stresses that the United Nations must play the central role in identifying a common peacebuilding vision, in bringing together the various actors and in acting as a bridge between national authorities and various peacebuilding and development actors.

Some of these issues were addressed by the Working Group on Lessons Learned — an effort with which we have been associated. We believe that its conclusions — inter alia in relation to the role of the Peacebuilding Commission in marshalling resources, on the imperative of national dialogue in post-conflict situations and the role of young people — are particularly relevant to the further evolution of peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding emerged from peacekeeping. The United Nations has made enormous investments of manpower and resources in multidimensional peacekeeping operations mandated to operate in fragile States. We are now in the midst of another paradigmatic shift into peacekeeping/peacebuilding operations or purely peacebuilding operations.

India brings to the table the experience of almost 60 years of peacekeeping. We have contributed more peacekeepers to more peacekeeping operations than any other country. We have also participated in every type of peacekeeping operation, from truce supervision to the current generation of purely peacebuilding initiatives.

Based on this experience, my delegation stresses that peacekeeping is early peacebuilding. Our peacekeepers in the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia, the United Nations Operation in Somalia II, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United Nations Mission in the Sudan, the United Nations Mission in Liberia and the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti have been early peacebuilders. We believe that the process of implementing a peace agreement must run side by side with the provision of humanitarian and emergency assistance; with the creation of political institutions that can resolve conflicts, reconcile parties to conflicts and allow dialogue between the State and the governed; with security sector reform; with administrative and economic restructuring; and with empowering the weak, building a human rights culture and resuming economic activity.

National ownership is the key determinant of success in peacebuilding. The international community can encourage, motivate and facilitate. It cannot solve those problems which require national will and national ownership.

We believe, however, that the international community has the duty to make available appropriate capacities to national authorities. The solutions and capacities that these authorities seek are those that have been tried and tested in similar environments elsewhere. Countries like India have successfully surmounted many of the challenges that have produced these conflicts. The shared colonial legacy that produced these challenges and our experience and that of other nations which have faced similar difficulties has particular relevance to the problem at hand. The success of the all-female Indian formed police unit in Liberia is a good example of how the capacities and experience of the global South can be leveraged in peacebuilding situations.

It is also the responsibility of the international community to provide the resources. Complex peacekeeping operations usually have a lifespan that is measured in years. Peacebuilding operations will last for decades and require a predictable and appropriate level of resources over extended periods of time.

India strongly supports the role and relevance of regional players in post-conflict scenarios. We are greatly encouraged by the African Union's efforts to develop post-conflict reconstruction capacities. The success of the New Partnership for Africa's Development and the African Peer Review Mechanism has many lessons that are relevant to the strengthening of national ownership.

The Secretariat and the funds and programmes must do a great deal more to become effective players. Skill sets and expertise that are relevant to these societies need to be augmented. In an earlier debate, I spoke about the ponderous nature of the United Nations bureaucracy and pointed out that an organization that takes up to 200 days to fill positions in the field can hardly be a model worthy of emulation when it comes to institution-building.

In concluding, I would like to point out that India has engaged bilaterally with a number of nations on the peacekeeping/peacebuilding agenda in response to national requirements. We also have contributed, along with my fellow delegations of Brazil and South Africa, through plurilateral mechanisms, such as the India, Brazil and South Africa Trilateral initiative, that are active in peacebuilding. We are committed to this process and will continue to remain fully engaged.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are grateful to the Permanent Representative of Germany and the Chairs of the country configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Permanent Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Jordan, Luxembourg and Sweden, for preparing the report on the work of the fourth session of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2011/41). We thank the Permanent Representatives of Germany and Rwanda, the former and current Chairs of the PBC, for presenting their reports and their vision of the roles of the PBC.

We welcome the outcomes of the already fourth year of the work of the PBC. This period has been of particular importance to the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations. The first five-year review of the PBC's activities was a success. Its outcome should contribute to further enhancing the effectiveness of the Commission in coordinating international peacebuilding efforts and in crafting recommendations on the rehabilitation of States and the restoration of economic stability in countries that have emerged from the hot phases of crisis.

Thorough work has been done within the country configurations. One of the great merits of the PBC is its ability to establish a direct dialogue with national Governments and to ensure their leading role and responsibilities for the peacebuilding process. We also see evidence of the growing credibility of the PBC in the recent addition to its agenda of two new countries, Liberia and Guinea.

In the broader peacebuilding context, we note the issuance of the report of the Secretary-General's Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities in the aftermath of conflict. We continue to explore the conclusions and proposals of that document. Our position is that the leading role in any consideration of its recommendations should be played by the General Assembly and its Fifth Committee. Furthermore, we believe that one key aspect of the system of international peacekeeping is the establishment of qualified staffing reserves consisting of national teams of civilian experts. The Russian Federation has already submitted to the Secretariat lists of national experts in various fields.

The Russian Federation views peacebuilding as an important tool for ensuring international peace and stability. It should be based on the principle of national ownership in defining priorities and approaches to their implementation, as well as on building the institutional capacities of States that are recipients of international assistance. It is only national stakeholders that can ensure sustainable peaceful development.

A key component of post-conflict peacebuilding entails establishing and building national institutional capacity. That should become a system-wide priority for the entire United Nations in deeds, not just words. Achieving sustained peace and stability is only possible when the entirety of ownership lies with the national players.

The Russian Federation attaches great importance to the activities of the PBC as the unique advisory mechanism mandated to coordinate peacebuilding activities in the United Nations system and outside it, and for crafting peacebuilding strategies as well as mobilizing international cooperation for post-conflict reconstruction. At the same time, we suggest that the Commission could be more active in taking on the tasks of peacebuilding and socio-economic reform that are currently entrusted to peacekeeping operations.

We attach great importance to the Peacebuilding Fund as a mechanism for immediate financing that can contribute to long-term mechanisms for assistance in reconstruction and development. Our position is underscored by our annual contribution to the Fund, which totals $2 million.

Mr. Moraes Cabral (Portugal): Thank you for organizing this important debate, Mr. President. I also wish to thank Ambassador Wittig for presenting his report and for his commitment and leadership while he was in charge of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I also thank Ambassador Gasana for his statement and assure him of our constant support in his important task. I would also like to warmly greet Ambassador Viotti and the other Chairs of the country-specific configurations present here during our debate.

We welcome the progress of the PBC as reflected in its report (S/2011/41). Over the past five years, the Commission has established itself as a relevant platform for international assistance in the transition of post-conflict societies towards durable peace. We now have a more focused, thematic approach and a better understanding of priorities and of how the PBC fits into the larger set of international actors. We have, as well, the lessons learned from five country-specific configurations, which, we believe, is experience that

will certainly be valuable for the recently created configuration for the Republic of Guinea.

Portugal takes pride in its active participation in four PBC configurations, as we are strong supporters of an approach that takes into account the relationship between security and development and its implications for integrated action by the international community in post-conflict societies, which are particularly fragile ones. The PBC is in a unique position to ensure that socio-economic progress effectively functions as a promoter of stability. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, as already mentioned by Ambassador Maria Luiza Viotti, I would also like to underline the role of the PBC configuration in the process that led to the debt relief, resulting from Guinea-Bissau reaching the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries completion point of the International Monetary Fund. The debt relief, together with a recently approved new tranche of Peacebuilding Fund financial support, will create the conditions for the Government of Guinea-Bissau to press forward with social and economic programmes and enhance the strengthening of national institutions. In the context of political fragility, the PBC's role is certainly an important contribution to stability in that particular country, which faces, as we all know, a number of serious challenges.

Allow me now to focus on a number of challenges that in our view merit particular attention. First, there is a challenge for the visibility of the PBC in its capacity to coordinate with other actors present in the countries where it intervenes. There is no denying that the PBC is a catalyst for mobilizing donors' resources, identifying financing gaps and priorities for international assistance. But this should translate into actual work being carried out on the ground. Besides dealing with the regular planning and articulation of the national authorities, the PBC should be more systematically involved early on with other actors, first and foremost with the other United Nations agencies but also with bilateral partners, international financial institutions and regional organizations. We note with satisfaction that this issue is one of the main aspects of the PBC road map for actions in 2011.

Secondly, there is the challenge of greater engagement of the PBC in development issues. The report indicates a growing trend to include development aspects in priority plans, especially concerning the problem of youth unemployment, an issue with serious destabilizing potential, especially in Africa. PBC engagement in this field, however, requires a more consistent dialogue with development agencies to promote a peacebuilding approach in their assistance efforts. There are also a number of other issues besides youth employment with great potential in terms of peace dividends and long-term stability. These include promoting economic activities, health and education, and gender equality, as well as the mitigation of the effects of climate change.

Finally, we should work towards strengthening relations between the PBC and other United Nations organs. On Monday the General Assembly held a very rich debate on this same report (see A/65/PV.79). I think we should value the Assembly's contribution in our reflections and efforts to strengthen peacebuilding.

In what concerns the Security Council, the report, as well as other reports and documents produced in each of the country-specific configurations, contains much valuable information on how the work of the PBC can feed into Security Council discussions, namely, those on the establishment, renewal and conclusion of mission mandates. We should work collectively to improve our working methods in order to allow us to draw regularly on the advice of Chairs of country-specific configurations. The interactive dialogue on Burundi, with the participation of the Chair of the PBC country-specific configuration, promoted by the Brazilian presidency of the Security Council last month, was an excellent practice. We should be able to develop other formats that would serve the same purpose of further engagement of the PBC with the Council.

In conclusion, the success of the PBC in fulfilling its task represents our collective success in our efforts towards achieving sustainable peace. We are aware of the challenges before us in improving our capacity to deal with peacebuilding tasks. Let us also be creative in reaching out and devising appropriate ways to address those challenges.

Mr. Messone (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation thanks you, Mr. President, for this opportunity to debate the report (S/2011/41) on the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for the period between 1 July 2009 and 31 December 2010. We also thank Ambassador Peter Wittig for his excellent presentation of the report and for the skill with which he has discharged his duties as Chair of the Commission. We would also like to convey to his

successor, Ambassador Gasana, our best wishes for success in his new post, and to assure him of our support.

With regard to the ever more important role of the Peacebuilding Commission in the post-conflict peacebuilding process, my delegation welcomes the commitment that has been expressed here on the part of the international community for strengthening the capacity and resources of the Commission so as to enable it to act more effectively on the ground. It is in that context that we welcome the work done by the co-facilitators — the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa — in reviewing the United Nations peacebuilding architecture with the goal of making it more operational. We welcome the fact that the recommendations made as a result of their consultations have already begun to be applied by the Commission, as the report under discussion attests.

It seems to us that there are two particularly important aspects associated with our desire to strengthen the peacebuilding architecture, namely, the partnerships that the Commission has to forge with the various actors involved in the peacebuilding process and the central role that the host country must play in that process. With regard to the first point, my delegation welcomes the approach taken by the Commission in relation to international financial institutions and donors, for some efforts require a stronger international commitment and more resources and, without prejudice to the issue of the most effective strategies, it is important to increase the resources of the Peacebuilding Fund and its main components.

Similarly, cooperation with regional and subregional organizations and, indeed, with all other actors involved in peacebuilding activities, is essential. That is why peacebuilding should be a focal point of the dialogues held periodically by the United Nations with regional organizations. The Commission's ongoing cooperation with those entities is an essential factor in efforts to improve resource mobilization and, above all, to more effectively coordinate and harmonize actions on the ground. In that context, we support the Commission's relationship with the main organs of the United Nations, in particular the General Assembly, our Council and the Economic and Social Council.

In the Security Council, we recognize that the links between peacekeeping and peacebuilding are growing and require the Commission to be more effective in fulfilling its advisory role vis-à-vis the conduct of peacekeeping missions. For instance, we support the Commission's recommendations to the Council regarding the situation in the Central African Republic. Those recommendations called for increased financial support for the stabilization of the country, for the Economic Community of Central African States to provide military observers for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes, and for the subregional military presence of the Mission for the Consolidation of Peace in the Central African Republic.

Regarding the second point, my delegation believes it important to mention that peacebuilding cannot occur without the involvement of the recipient country. Indeed, national ownership and the strengthening of existing capacities are the two main pillars of the recovery process for countries emerging from conflict.

The Central African Republic configuration, of which my country, Gabon, is a member, can once again serve as a good example. Indeed, the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding and the poverty reduction strategy paper were created by the Central African Government, in partnership with the Commission. In that context, we suggest that the Council consider the Commission's potential role in the Sudan in terms of post-referendum issues.

National or local ownership, a key component of the strategy adopted by the Commission, should transcend the governmental sphere. All segments of the population should therefore be involved in programmes launched as part of the peacebuilding process. The issues of youth unemployment, the reintegration of ex-combatants and the situation of such vulnerable groups as women and girls must be accorded the highest priority. Attention should also be paid to the issue of political governance in the actions of the Commission, because it is a factor that could play a role in any return to conflict. That was the intent behind the 2009 review of the Peacebuilding Fund's guiding principles, which was undertaken to ensure that the Fund would be able to respond to real needs. Greater account must also be taken of existing national capacities in peacebuilding activities.

As the international community is not usually called upon to remain indefinitely in a country

emerging from conflict, it would be useful in the future for such countries to work with the countries concerned to formulate a priority action plan to establish sustainable peace. The action plan should include security sector reform, socio-economic development, youth employment, national reconciliation, good governance and the rule of law. The Commission's activities should create no local dependency that would make it difficult for the international community to leave.

I would like to highlight the challenges and issues that should be further discussed in terms of the role of the Commission. One is how to coordinate the various actors involved in such a way as to not complicate the conduct of operations, and how to reconcile the approaches and modus operandi of the various actors. Another is how to better take into account the specificities of each situation. A further issue is how to ensure participation at the national level so that ownership is not limited solely to the elites.

Finally, I reiterate our support for the Peacebuilding Commission, which is playing an increasingly important role in the international community's efforts to help countries devastated by conflict to regain their footing.

Mr. Barbalić (Bosnia and Herzegovina): I, too, should like to thank Ambassadors Wittig and Gasana for their comprehensive briefings.

At the outset, I would like to underline that fact that Bosnia and Herzegovina considers the Peacebuilding Commission to be one of the most important components of the security architecture of the United Nations. Over the past few months, several important debates and initiatives have been undertaken with the aim of enhancing the coherence and effectiveness of United Nations engagement in peacebuilding activities. Consequently, the evolving nature of the Peacebuilding Commission has continued to focus the attention of the international community on the countries on its agenda.

We further believe that, in order to improve the Commission's impact on the ground, a common vision for engagement in a given country is essential. It is equally important to build and strengthen partnerships with key peacebuilding actors, international financial institutions and regional and subregional institutions. In that process, the focus should be on building upon existing national strategies and priorities so as to reinforce national ownership and capacity. Another important issue is identifying critical funding and policy gaps and leveraging the resources of multilateral and bilateral donors to address those gaps in a timely, flexible and predictable manner. The division of roles and responsibilities is necessary to bridge short-term activities in the aftermath of conflict and long-term visions that lead to sustainable peace and development.

In that regard, measuring the impact of peacebuilding activities in the field is crucial. Reviews of the Strategic Frameworks for Peacebuilding and efforts to harmonize them with the views expressed in the poverty reduction strategy papers can be important activities leading to better planning and greater delivery of results on the ground.

We are also of the view that greater synergy is needed between the Commission's country configurations and the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in order to ensure that collective efforts are coherent and mutually reinforcing. In particular, that process involves reinforcing shared accountability between the countries concerned and international partners, strengthening coherent planning for peacebuilding strategies, financing for peacebuilding and leveraging capacities and expertise. We emphasize that planning for peacebuilding must not be a supply-driven process. On the contrary, it has to be focused and centred on the needs of the host country.

We consider that the cooperation between the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) needs to be maximized through enhanced consultations and dialogue in order to provide sustained support for the countries on the Commission's agenda and to align the Commission's engagement with the plans of the Fund.

With regard to country configurations, the Commission has continued to increase its engagement by supporting the electoral process in Burundi and activities related to the peacebuilding elements of the Agenda for Change of the Government of Sierra Leone, including good governance, the rule of law and youth employment. We welcome the efforts of the Commission that fostered integration of the political mandate of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone with the development mandates of the United Nations agencies, making the Agenda a central peace and development framework for the international community.

We are of the view that engagement in Guinea-Bissau will help in building democratic governance and effectively addressing the key challenges facing the country, including enhancing the civilian institutions of the security sector. As for the Central African Republic, it will boost support for peacebuilding priorities identified by the Commission, the Government and civil society.

The constructive work of the Commission contributed to adding two new members to the Commission's agenda, Liberia and Guinea-Bissau. We believe that a new instrument of engagement, the statement of mutual commitment, will contribute to better identifying the main risks and challenges facing the peacebuilding process and therefore expedite the engagement process. However, enhancing national ownership and building national capacities will lay the foundations for economic growth, peace consolidation and sustainable development.

Bosnia and Herzegovina welcomes the practice of inviting the Chairs of the country configurations to brief the Council. This is important not only for the Commission's role in highlighting the correlation between security and development, but also for confirming the Commission's tangible results in a specific country.

In light of the PBC 2010 review, it is necessary to develop a practical mechanism to track progress in the work of the Commission with regard to creating a single planning document for a specific country, intensifying resource mobilization efforts, development aspects of peacebuilding or activities with the PBF.

Finally, while we emphasize that much has been achieved in the past, we believe that the Commission should perform better analysis, provide important advice to the principal organs of the United Nations, and improve its working methods and the linkage between work at Headquarters and in the field in order to achieve better results. Bosnia and Herzegovina remains fully committed to supporting its work.

Mr. Briens (France) (*spoke in French*): I thank Ambassador Wittig for his excellent work as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2010 and Ambassador Gasana for the vigour with which he has taken over the role.

Today we welcome with satisfaction the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2011/41). The year 2010 was important for the Commission, which saw its policies come of age and its objectives better defined. We are pleased to note the interest the Commission attracts. This year saw the development of an ambitious reform project led by the Ambassadors of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa. We wish to reiterate our support for the implementation of the recommendations of the report, and in particular the 2011 road map drawn up under Germany's leadership. We encourage the new chairmanship to examine possibilities for the Commission to establish new partnerships with financial institutions, in particular the African Development Bank.

The appeal of the PBC was confirmed by the addition to its agenda of Liberia in September 2010 and Guinea in February 2011. We recall our commitment to those countries and strongly encourage them to stay the course towards peace and democracy.

Despite these positive developments, we must keep in mind that the recommendations of the co-facilitators' report have not yet taken effect and that the PBC has yet to find its place in the United Nations system. The Commission is still too often considered by States emerging from conflict as an additional donor. However, the true added value of the PBC lies in its political support and advocacy functions. I stress that the PBC is first and foremost a political platform. In this context, if the PBC is to be able to keep international attention focused on countries emerging from conflict, host countries should be prepared to make real commitments, because peacebuilding does not end with the successful holding of democratic elections.

The six countries on the Commission's agenda have thus had to step up their efforts, with the support of the country-specific configurations of the PBC. For host countries, being placed on the agenda is the beginning of a long process that can be concluded only by the national authorities. National ownership, which is often highlighted, needs to be embodied in the ambitious implementation of programmes promoting good governance, anti-corruption efforts, security sector reform, the rule of law and national reconciliation.

Let me take this opportunity to commend the report of Jean-Marie Guéhenno on civilian capacity development (S/2011/85). The report is an important step, which we wish to support. Many of its proposals

could be implemented immediately, and we encourage the Secretariat to be ambitious in implementing it. Some of the recommendations, however, will have to be validated by all of the States of the international community. It will therefore be important to build consensus that goes beyond the traditional rifts.

The Peacebuilding Commission is the most representative and legitimate body of the United Nations for promoting national civilian capacity-building, triangular cooperation — among international organizations, donor countries and host countries — and South-South cooperation. In this respect, we believe that the Organizational Committee of the Commission should consider adding the evaluation of that recent, innovative report to its agenda in the near future.

Mr. Dunn (United States of America): I thank Ambassador Wittig for his briefing and his commitment to peacebuilding and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I also wish to thank Ambassador Gasana for his leadership this year, as well as the Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific configurations, who facilitate the PBC's work in the field and in New York. The United States continues to support the Commission wholeheartedly.

Promoting sustainable peace is at the heart of the United Nations work. The Peacebuilding Commission continues to gain strength as an institution. It plays a crucial role in several important ways, calling our attention to countries emerging form conflict, offering advice, and proposing strategies to build sustainable peace after the guns have fallen silent. We commend the Commission for its efforts to address many of the shortcomings identified in last year's annual review, and we appreciate the progress it has made this year, in particular in the countries on its agenda.

We commend the Commission's efforts to alleviate the administrative burden on those it hopes to help by drawing more from existing strategic planning processes and documents. We saw this in Sierra Leone, where the Commission aligned its engagement with the Government' agenda for change and leveraged the expertise and experience of international actors and regional bodies to tackle poor governance, youth unemployment and widespread drug trafficking. We saw it again in the Central African Republic, where the Commission tailored its strategic framework to correspond to the country's poverty reduction strategy. We saw it in Burundi, where the Commission worked with international stakeholders to ensure free and fair elections and where the Commission's work to support political dialogue among the ruling party and opposition elements has proven particularly important as Burundi has solidified its peace.

We also applaud the Commission's quick start in Liberia. Liberia was added to the PBC's agenda within six months of that country's request, and an innovative statement of mutual commitment was endorsed by the Commission and Liberia's Government. Liberia has already, with the PBC's help, begun construction on the first of five regional security hubs to address the root causes of conflict at the community level and help transfer security management from the United Nations peacekeeping mission to the Government of Liberia in the coming years.

We also appreciate the efforts of the Working Group on Lessons Learned, which shares and disseminates information and success stories on high-priority areas on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda. We urge the Working Group to continue to foster meaningful dialogue and to link its discussions and findings more directly to programmes in the field. Such ties are essential if the valuable lessons put forth by the Working Group are to be incorporated into the Commission's ongoing work.

Despite considerable progress, the Commission still faces real challenges. In order to better serve as the leading authority on peacebuilding, the Commission must work harder to link ambitions in New York with programmes and national leadership in the field. It must also improve coordination with international institutions on needs assessments and programmes in post-conflict countries. The PBC should continue to promote national ownership by focusing early on developing national capacities and measuring the impact that peacebuilding has in the field.

We also believe that the Commission should work more closely with its key partners, in particular the international financial institutions. This will allow the Commission to build on the experience and knowledge of partner institutions and work towards common goals to create sustainable peace. We must also work to achieve a coherent vision and to coordinate efforts across all players in countries with a United Nations peacebuilding presence. A key aspect of achieving this vision is working closely with leadership within

countries emerging from conflict. As the Commission continues to grow and add more countries to its agenda, it is even more critical that it possess the peacebuilding capacities to advance international peace and security and improve the prospects for success in post-conflict countries.

The time is now, as more countries are turning to the United Nations for resources and assistance in dealing with conflict. The Commission must continue to build on the progress it has made to help the countries on its agenda build peace that will truly endure.

Mr. Mashabane (South Africa): We thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this meeting on the report (S/2011/41) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We wish to express our sincere gratitude to the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Wittig, for his leadership of the Commission during the past year. We also thank the Chairs of the five country-specific configurations for Burundi, Sierra Leone, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia, for their dedication and hard work. We thank the Peacebuilding Support Office for its invaluable support to the PBC.

South Africa looks forward to the leadership of the new Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Gasana, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda. My delegation stands ready to contribute concretely to peacebuilding activities through our membership in the sixth country-specific configuration.

The Peacebuilding Commission has made a considerable contribution to United Nations peacebuilding efforts since it was established. The recent of addition of Liberia and Guinea to the Commission's agenda is another indication of the significance of the work of the Commission. However, more still needs to be done if we are to achieve the objective of preventing the relapse of countries into conflict and building durable peace.

We welcome the support provided by the international community to the Commission through the PBC country-specific configurations. The five countries currently on the PBC's agenda have received assistance in various ways, including through the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and other programmes. The Commission played a critical role in Burundi and in the Central African Republic by providing support for the election processes and mobilizing financial resources to bridge the funding gap in the electoral budgets. That contribution of the Commission went a long way towards ensuring that the two countries held successful elections.

The Commission's interaction with the Security Council has improved. However, there is still scope for further improvement. We still believe that the PBC has a crucial role to play in advising the Security Council on peacebuilding elements that could be integrated into peacebuilding mandates. We are certain that such advice is important to enhancing the Council's peacebuilding efforts.

We encourage the Commission to continue to strengthen its relationship with other bodies of the United Nations, in particular the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We appreciate the Commission's efforts to build collaboration and partnership with a wide range of stakeholders through outreach activities. South Africa believes that the Peacebuilding Commission could improve its reporting by also focusing and reflecting more on the following five areas.

First, it should focus on better coordination of peacebuilding initiatives among the stakeholders. Secondly, greater consideration should be given to the visibility of women and civil society in peacebuilding, including in providing leadership on socio-economic development issues. Thirdly, the report should focus on further enhancing cooperation and information-sharing. For example, lessons learned should be shared among the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations agencies, such as the United Nations Development Programme. Fourthly, the role of regional authorities and stakeholders in peacebuilding processes should be emphasized. In this context, local ownership and prioritization become important, and more could be done jointly in consultation with the authorities in countries emerging from conflict. Fifthly, the report should also elaborate on the Commission's activities in partnership with the international financial institutions. That partnership is certainly important in light of the nexus between peace and security.

The Peacebuilding Fund has provided critical assistance to countries emerging from conflict. South Africa encourages greater interaction and collaboration between the PBC and the PBF in ascertaining how countries emerging from conflict can be assisted financially in accordance with their priorities and

national vision. It is important that the existing complementarities between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund be sustained and maintained. South Africa believes that the Peacebuilding Support Office, in partnership with the broader United Nations system, adds enormous value to peacebuilding efforts.

In conclusion, it is our sincere hope that the recommendations of the 2010 review of the peacebuilding process will add value to the work of the Commission by enhancing and improving coherence, coordination and collaboration, including by enhancing the relationships among the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly and other partners.

Mr. Osorio (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to express my appreciation to Ambassador Wittig, the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, for his briefing and for the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2011/41). His work at the helm of the Commission is worthy of praise and recognition. I would also like to thank Ambassador Gasana, the current Chair, and to wish him the greatest success.

The activities of the Peacebuilding Commission during this past year and a half show the important progress it has made in fulfilling its mandate and the need to take comprehensive steps to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding the recommendations that emerged from the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The various actors involved in peacebuilding highlight the ongoing need to identify areas for joint work, cooperation and coordination so as to avoid duplication of efforts, enhance synergies and make the best possible use of available resources. In that respect, we underscore the leadership role played by the Commission in making maximum use of the capacities available in the United Nations, the international financial institutions and the donor community, and in forming partnerships and improving coordination with the entities participating in those initiatives. We therefore place a high value on cooperation between the Commission and regional organizations and international financial institutions, especially the African Union, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

With the recent addition of Liberia and Guinea-Bissau to the Commission's agenda, the pressing need for national ownership is clearer than ever, given that the role of the international community is to help create a national process based on the needs identified by the particular country. An important step forward in the implementation of that principle came with the statement of mutual commitment in Liberia. We encourage the Peacebuilding Commission to continue to focus its activities on such initiatives.

A central aspect of the review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission was its institutional relationship with the main organs of the United Nations, especially the Security Council. Within the Council, there should be increased efforts to seek the participation of the configuration Chairs in those meetings at which we consider the peacebuilding status in the respective countries so as to coordinate the work of United Nations agencies on the ground, improve planning and clearly establish actions to be undertaken for early peacebuilding components of peacekeeping operations.

We welcome the Commission's intention to submit more analytical reports, addressing matters such as the use and fostering of national capacities and the sustainability of resources. The assessment of these and other matters should be undertaken in cross-cutting manner by the configurations so as to promote evaluation of the activities within the jurisdictions delineated in their mandates.

Lastly, allow me to underscore the need to increase our political, economic and technical commitment to the Commission. It is only with determined support that we will be able to develop the Commission's full potential and grant it its proper role in preventing relapses into conflict.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): My delegation thanks you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting on the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2011/41). I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have extended their appreciation to Ambassador Peter Wittig for his briefing and especially for his remarkable contribution in his former role as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I also want to thank Ambassador Gasana, the current Chair, for his insights. We want to assure him of our unalloyed support in his new responsibilities.

Over the past year, we have been afforded numerous opportunities to better understand how the work of the Security Council interfaces with peacebuilding goals. This Council has been enriched by its acknowledgement of how, in achieving security ends, we can contribute to the fulfilment of long-term development through peacebuilding activities. The recent Council debates on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict and women's participation in peacebuilding, institution-building and the interdependence of security and development have all been excellent opportunities for the Council to develop a keener appreciation of the part that we play in the peacebuilding agenda. Indeed, all of these debates have attested to the value of peacebuilding as a tool for preventive diplomacy.

The review of international civilian capacities and the five-year review of the peacebuilding architecture dovetail neatly with the conclusions in the annual report of the PBC. What Nigeria takes from these three work streams is the overarching and critical importance of cooperation. It is clear from the work of all the configurations of the Commission that their goals cannot be achieved in isolation without the participation of other key actors, including national Governments, regional organizations, international financial institutions, other United Nations agencies, bodies and funds, and civil society.

Liberia is proving to be an excellent case for cooperation and innovation. With the adoption of the statement of mutual commitment, the Government of Liberia is firmly in the driving seat in terms of identifying priorities and ensuring that service delivery is demand-driven. Such cooperative efforts, which emphasize national ownership, attest to the commitment of the Liberia configuration and to the vision of the Commission itself.

The cooperation of regional organizations remains an essential element of the peacebuilding toolkit, and one that we must encourage in this Council. We welcome, for example, the partnership of the African Union (AU), among others, in closing the funding gap for Burundi's 2010 elections. In addition, we believe that the March 2010 meeting on partnership for peacebuilding, which was attended by representatives of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the European Union, the AU and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, was an important forum for exploring and advocating for stronger, more enduring partnerships to build and sustain peace in fragile or conflict-sensitive societies.

If we are able to identify more effective ways of mobilizing resources for Africa's peacebuilding initiatives, and to identify the appropriate peacebuilding priorities, countries emerging from conflict will no doubt be better served by the United Nations system. In this vein, Nigeria fully supports the annual joint meeting of the PBC and the AU Peace and Security Council, which follows the annual consultative meeting of members of the Security Council and the AU Peace and Security Council. We believe that these meetings can help to bridge the gaps inherent in addressing the nexus between peacekeeping and peacebuilding and, indeed, the broader relationship between security and development in Africa.

The Working Group on Lessons Learned has rightly drawn from national experiences to highlight the centrality of development aspects of peacebuilding. Reducing youth unemployment, developing income-generating activities, debt relief, skills training and promoting women's employment and economic empowerment are essential strategies for laying a solid economic foundation for peace and stability. It is with this in mind that Nigeria approved 0.7 million units of account in debt relief under the Nigeria Trust Fund for Burundi and Togo.

Despite the significant gains in peacebuilding in this reporting period, many challenges evidently remain in nations such as Guinea-Bissau — as Ambassador Viotti will attest — and the Central African Republic. In Guinea-Bissau, we look forward to the outcome of the planned joint mission of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the United Nations and the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries. We truly believe that Guinea-Bissau can and will overcome its security sector reform challenges so that the country can benefit from the gains achieved by the PBC, ECOWAS and other actors in pursuit of democratic governance.

We accept that there are serious challenges to be addressed in the Central African Republic in the era following the drawdown of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad. Specifically, the configuration must prioritize its support to the Government's efforts in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and in institutional capacity-building. While these challenges are no doubt daunting, we

stress that they can be overcome through concerted and collective action. We firmly believe that the PBC is best placed to bring together the efforts of all stakeholders in order to devise appropriate strategies to assist post-conflict countries.

The PBC, as we have all acknowledged, has already shown us its effectiveness in harnessing the strengths of multiple development and security actors. The PBC can marshal and has marshaled the resources, the know-how and the political will of the international community in a way that anchors the Security Council's quest for lasting peace. We therefore lend our full support and commitment to its efforts and trust that we will soon maximize the PBC's potential and, ultimately, fulfil the basic objectives for which it was established.

Ms. Ziade (Lebanon): I thank you, Sir, for having organized this meeting. I would also like to thank Ambassador Wittig for ably chairing the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2010 and to extend to the current PBC Chairperson, Ambassador Gasana, my sincere wishes for success in his endeavours.

Tangible results have been achieved through the PBC's engagement in country-specific situations. From the supportive role it played during the elections in Burundi to the economic revitalization it helped foster in Sierra Leone, the PBC has proved its added value as the main platform for peacebuilding activities within the United Nations system. Furthermore, steady requests made by countries emerging from conflict for inclusion on the Commission's agenda reflect the level of expectation associated with it.

However, different levels of challenges remain in the countries on the Commission's agenda. The review of the peacebuilding architecture concluded this year created valuable momentum on which we could build to face those challenges in a comprehensive manner. In this regard, we are pleased to note that the Commission's report on its fourth session (S/2011/41) takes into account the recommendations emanating from the recently concluded review process. We also note with appreciation the progress made in response to a number of those recommendations. However, we need to redouble our efforts to meet the expectations generated by the review and its recommendations. In our view, sustained attention needs to be given to the progress achieved in the following vital areas.

First, the PBC must keep national ownership at the forefront of its activities by involving populations as quickly and extensively as possible within their own governance architecture. Such engagement should be context-sensitive and orient different actors and partners towards re-establishing national capacities for governance and service delivery, according to the specific needs of the country concerned.

Secondly, it is essential to enhance synergy between the PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund in a way that ensures supply-driven funding that would support broader peacebuilding objectives. Mutual commitments between national stakeholders and their regional and international partners need to be coupled with mutual accountability.

Thirdly, it is also essential that all Organizational Committee members and senior United Nations leaders use their political weight and commitment to align actors around common peacebuilding objectives.

Fourthly, the Security Council should make better use of the advisory capacity of the PBC through a more proactive and dynamic linkage between the Commission and the Council, as has been stated and pointed out by Ambassador Wittig. In that regard, we encourage closer engagement by the Chairs of country configurations with the Council, which can benefit from their input and views during relevant country-specific discussions.

It is important at this stage to build on previous achievements in a way that the activities of the Commission acquire a cumulative nature. Therefore, we regard the road map of actions for 2011 as a living document. We look forward to the forthcoming progress report and to the practical approach to be developed by the PBC to track the progress made in the implementation of the PBC review's recommendations.

The evolution of the PBC in the coming years will greatly influence the shape and direction that peace and stability take in many post-conflict countries. Let us provide it with the necessary tools for the success of that undertaking.

The President (*spoke in Chinese*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of China.

I thank Ambassador Wittig for presenting the annual report (S/2011/41) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I appreciate the effective activities carried out by the PBC under his leadership. I also welcome the statement delivered by Ambassador

Gasana, Chairman of the PBC. I should like to make four brief points.

First, the United Nations should formulate a comprehensive, coordinated and integrated strategy for conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. United Nations peacekeeping operations can contribute to the early stages of recovery, development and reconstruction. China supports the PBC playing a full role in helping post-conflict countries in the areas of peace, reconstruction, financing and coordinating international assistance. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations should both include an exit strategy to encourage post-conflict countries to stand on their own at an early date.

Secondly, the countries concerned bear the primary responsibility for peacebuilding. While formulating peacebuilding strategies, the PBC should respect the sovereignty and independence of the countries concerned. China believes that, in providing assistance to post-conflict countries, the international community should give priority to national capacity-building, youth employment and economic and social development.

Thirdly, the United Nations and the relevant international organizations should strengthen their cooperation in the area of peacebuilding and use their respective advantages. We support close cooperation between the PBC, the Security Council, other major organs of the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions, other international agencies and regional organizations. China welcomes the PBC's provision of useful advice to the Security Council.

Fourthly, China supports continued efforts to improve the working methods of the PBC. We hope that the Commission will continue to improve its efficiency and focus on results in the relevant activities on the ground in the countries concerned.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.